Inside This Issue

- **Trump 3rd Term? Choose Cult of Personality or Constitution**
- **Trump's Tariffs: Don't Be Frightened by the Wailing and Gnashing of Teeth**
- **China: Xi's Regime Is Hardening, Darkening**
- **Having Trouble Sleeping? Blame Climate Change!**
- **Musk Funding $100M Prize for … Carbon Removal!**
- **STAND YOUR GROUND: Fight the CO_2 Pipeline**
- **Oklahoma City Bombing: 30th Anniversary**
- **OKC Bombing: What Really Happened?**
- **Klaus Schwab Steps Down (Sort of) at WEF**

Trump 3rd Term? Choose Cult of Personality or Constitution

We can be grateful for many things that President Trump is doing and has already done. And we should appreciate the many ordeals he has suffered at the hands of the Deep State enemy within. But let's not go overboard. Some Christians (and Jews) compare him to the Messiah or the Biblical Cyrus or King David. Trump, who has never been accused of lacking in the ego department, has apparently imbibed of this exciting, self-exalting elixir. Steve Bannon and other Trumpists have been flogging the idea of a third term. And Trump himself has recently broached the issue.

The Trump haters and the loonies of the Left are going apoplectic over this. Unfortunately, many MAGA conservatives reflexively take these loony Left eruptions as a cue to double down in their support *for* whatever the loonies are protesting *against*. Bad move. Bad logic. The third-term promoters are wrong. In this case the loonies are right, even if their motives are wrong.

For a bracing reality check on this misbegotten idea, please see Joe Wolverton's article "No Third Term: Preserving the Presidency Within Constitutional Bounds." — WFJ

Trump's Tariffs: Don't Be Frightened by the Wailing and Gnashing of Teeth

What are we to make of the Trump tariffs? If the legacy media is to believed, the welter of new tariffs has infuriated Wall Street billionaires, as well as, by some accounts, Trump's right-hand man Elon Musk. Tariffs, however, are not merely, or even primarily, financial matters; they have profound political, economic, and constitutional ramifications that must be taken into account for a full and clear picture of this contentious subject.

First of all, the constitutional. As we at *The New American* have been (until very recently) almost alone in pointing out, presidential tariffs are completely unconstitutional. Full stop. Tariffs are a form of taxation — indeed, for the Framers of the Constitution, THE form of taxation most congruent with limited government — and the power to raise revenue via taxation is unambiguously assigned to Congress in Article I. The

Contributors: Gary Benoit • Steve Bonta • Paul Dragu • Christian Gomez

William F. Jasper • Alex Newman • Peter Rykowski • Rebecca Terrell • Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Copyright ©2025 by *The New American*

#1
Veterinarian Recommended Brand
COSEQUIN®
JOINT HEALTH SUPPLEMENT
Cosequin® has a variety of formulas to help support your pet's healthy joints and cartilage.
Visit WWW.COSEQUIN.COM
nutramax LABORATORIES CONSUMER CARE, INC.

Executive Branch's power over revenue is limited to signing bills of appropriation and taxation into law or vetoing them if the president sees fit. And that includes levies in the form of tariffs. Up to the infamous Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, this was how tariffs were always levied.

The modern conceit that presidents can levy tariffs at will and without congressional say-so dates, as with so much of illegitimate Big Government, to FDR's New Deal. In June of 1934, Congress passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which gave FDR and all successive presidents the authority to change tariff rates by up to 50 percent. Implicit in the bill was that FDR could be trusted to phase out tariffs in favor of income and other direct taxes (such as corporate taxes and capital gains taxes), as well as the deft new financing trick of deficit spending coupled with inflation. This was, after all, the Brave New World of Marx's *Manifesto*, a proto-communist order in which an all-encompassing leviathan state was financed by a heavy, progressive income tax and a central bank with a monopoly over the money supply. In such a world, tariffs were to become an anachronistic afterthought.

But, in order to guarantee that outcome, they needed to be taken from Congress and reassigned to a pliant Executive Branch.

Until Trump, the grift worked perfectly. Every one of FDR's successors, Democrat and Republican alike, faithfully hewed to the Marxist anti-tariff mantra. Most ordinary Americans remain blissfully ignorant of how stridently tariffs were attacked by Marxists, Fabian socialists, and their ilk as paramount tools for capitalist domination.

Now, of course, Trump's many enemies, including a few Senate Republicans, are trying to pass legislation to take the tariff power away from Trump (doubtless with the intent of restoring it to the Executive Branch the moment the Oval Office is retaken by the Marxists). It is a signal irony of our time that, for once, the radical Left is absolutely correct, albeit for the wrong reasons: Congress should reclaim full authority over tariffs, authority it had no right to relinquish in the first place.

As for the politics of tariffs, Trump is mostly right, even if he is exercising the power illegitimately. America *is* getting ripped off by the likes of Canada, Mexico, Europe, and China. All of these countries, and many others besides, have huge tariffs on American goods, tariffs that, somehow, nobody in the Establishment finds at all objectionable because, well, America is so unjustly much richer than everybody else. Such tariffs, it is believed by some, help to level the playing field and redistribute the global wealth. For others, avowed devotees of "free trade," tariffs inhibit economic growth and should be eschewed on principle, even if other countries refuse to do so.

Both of these strands of argument completely miss two critical points, which Trump and at least some of his epigones, such as Peter Navarro, are trying to make, namely:

1) Governments need some source of revenue, and tariffs are the least intrusive form of taxation (or, as Churchill might have put it, tariffs are the worst form of taxation

except for all the others). If not tariffs, ye libertarians and champions of laissez-faire, then what form of taxation would you prefer to fund a limited government? Income taxes, graduated or otherwise? Perhaps some form of standardized poll tax? Capital gains taxes? Inflation? A uniform national sales tax, perhaps?

This last (usually billed as a "flat tax") has always been trotted out by "respectable" conservatives as an alternative to the income tax, while tariffs are never advocated. But such a national sales tax would be unavoidable for consumers, and most proposals advocate for very high rates, such as 10 or 15 percent. Tariffs, by contrast, are elective, once domestic production has attained proper levels: You only pay them if you opt to buy foreign goods for their cachet, their luxury, etc.

But, cries the anti-tariff faction, tariffs are protectionist, and the international division of labor is just the free market optimizing the production of goods. They ask, Would you put tariffs on mango importers and encourage Americans to grow tropical fruit in greenhouses instead, at much higher cost and lower quality? These types of hyperbolic arguments ignore the fact that the vast majority of offshored industry has not been pushed away because the climate or natural resources elsewhere are better; companies have left because political conditions have incentivized them to do so. How else can you explain the fact that, in spite of the vast distance and cost involved in trans-Pacific shipping, in spite of the constant need of language training and training in Western business practices, in spite of the risk cost of doing business in a country with a fickle communist government — in spite of these and many other factors — it STILL has become more economical for American corporations to sink vast resources into building and maintaining manufactories in China and ship the finished products all the way back to WalMart shelves in the heartland? It is because taxes and regulations have made it prohibitively expensive to set up shop on American soil, and NOT because conditions for manufacturing quality and efficiency in China are somehow vastly superior to those in the United States. Thus, the "mangoes in a greenhouse" canard is a straw-man argument where most economic activity is concerned.

2) All products are not created equal. In particular, manufacturing capacity (or lack thereof) has a severe impact on national security. Like it or not, trading with enemy regimes can result in the transfer of critical military technology, or can lead to said regimes using their control over critical products such as pharmaceuticals or rare earth minerals to exact concessions. We should have learned this during the Covid era, when we found ourselves dependent on China for medical supplies. Less recently, it was trade concessions to China in the mid-1990s that resulted in their acquisition from American aerospace corporations the technology to build working ICBMs that now threaten us. So, trade in tchotchkes like the inventory on Temu is one thing, but trade in critical technology and supplies is quite another.

What about the economic ramifications of tariffs? Well, strictly speaking tariffs — like all forms of taxation — do dampen and divert economic energies. But the proper question is whether they do so to a greater degree than

the other forms of taxation mentioned previously. The verdict of history appears to be that they do not. After all, the U.S. economy grew at an unexampled pace during the 19th century and well into the 20th, during the entire period when tariffs were the primary means of raising revenue. And that was during a time when the United States, unlike today, was in a state of near-constant war against the aboriginal population, and also fought a ruinous four-year Civil War that dwarfed every other conflict in the 19th century aside from China's Taiping Rebellion. Many of the tariffs enacted during that period were contentious, to be sure (the "Tariff of Abominations" of 1828 in particular), and tariffs played a role in triggering the Civil War itself. But the gargantuan American systems of taxation and inflation of the 20th century enabled a world war, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, countless other smaller wars worldwide, and the garrisoning of the entire planet by U.S. military forces.

Also, we note that, at the time of this writing, all of the dire prognostications of a stock market crash have failed to materialize. This is because, for all of their vapid vaporings, Wall Street financiers do not, in the main, understand how the real economy works — the economy in which regular people get dirty making stuff that people actually use.

If there is a crucial lesson from our own history that we have so far failed to internalize, it is this: If we prioritize economics over political principles, we end up with a financial oligarchy that serves up material goodies while keeping most Americans in lifelong economic and political bondage (i.e., the system that we now have). If, on the other hand, we prioritize political principles over economics, as most of the Founders did, we end up with good government, along with unrivalled economic strength as a bonus.

In sum: Trump's tariffs are, in the main, the right thing being done the wrong way. Tariffs are a robust exercise of national independence, and are a thumb in the eye of "world order." We should jettison the income tax, the capital gains tax, and all other such taxes, bring back gold and silver money, and eliminate the Federal Reserve. We should re-enshrine tariffs as the chief source of federal revenue. BUT … this should all be done by Congress, with the support of the president, instead of the other way around. If it continues to be done on Trump's initiative alone, you may be sure that, the moment Trump leaves office, Congress will fall over itself restoring the old order of income taxes, money printing, hyper-regulation — and nary a tariff to be seen. — SB

China: Xi's Regime Is Hardening, Darkening

To no one's surprise, the one country uninterested in negotiating over tariffs is China. This is in part because of traditional Chinese "face culture" (to negotiate under such conditions is to lose face) and in part because of the hubris inherent in communist ideology. Western analysts often mistakenly assume that communists (as well as radical Islamists) will react and act in their own best interest, more or less. This may be true of rational regimes and even many garden variety dictatorships, but it is not true of communist true believers, and never has been. Xi Jinping is fully prepared to take his country back to the rice paddies, the collective farms, and the mass starvation rather than concede an iota to the wicked capitalist exploiters. Modern China is not a whit less irrationally dogmatic than it was in the days of Mao, or than the Soviets were in their day. Many ordinary

Chinese have rejected the paranoia, xenophobia, and ideology of the Great Helmsman — but the Men Who Matter in Beijing have not. This is why China is responding with haughty indifference to the Trump tariffs, while continuing to militarize at a breakneck pace to prepare for war with the world over Taiwan and the South China Sea.

Much has been made in recent weeks over the apparent purge of a top Chinese military leader, He Weidong. But this is nothing new. Xi has been on a nonstop purge of the military and the upper Party echelons since coming to power in 2012. He is now in his own way as absolute a ruler in China as Kim Jong Un is in the Hermit Kingdom. Look for China to continue to seal itself off from the rest of the world as it enters yet another of its regular generational sulks characterized by retreat into national self-identity and scapegoating wicked foreigners for all of China's domestic problems. Whether this doom spiral will lead to a latter-day Boxer Rebellion, a wider international war, or societal implosion and mass starvation remains to be seen, but the future of Communist China under "Uncle Xi" is looking darker by the day. — SB

Having Trouble Sleeping? Blame Climate Change!

"The impact of rising ambient temperatures on sleep and its phases under climate change is becoming increasingly concerning but remains underexplored."

This "brilliant" statement begins the abstract of research published in the journal *Nature Communications* on March 17, 2025 — Saint Patrick's Day. But the "green" they're peddling is a darker shade than that of the Emerald Isle.

Instead, the authors hail from Shanghai and Beijing, China, where they compiled "sleep monitoring data of 23 million days from 214,445" mainland Chinese test subjects. They tallied that for every 10 degrees Celsius increase in ambient temperature, both sleep quality and duration decrease precipitously.

You may be thinking that 10 degrees Celsius is quite a jump! What did those poor test participants endure during this research?

Never fear; the authors did not measure actual indoor air temperature — a known factor that influences the quality of sleep. Instead, they used computer models. Of course they did! You can't tease out results you want from actual real-life data!

To be specific, they employed *projected* temperature data from the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and meteorological data from the European Union's NASA equivalent, Copernicus. They correlated this data with a "cardiopulmonary coupling" app on the smart devices worn by study participants.

What could go wrong?

After much data gridding, the authors calculated that "by the end of the century, sleep insufficiency could rise by 10.50%, with an annual loss of 33.28 hours of sleep per person." Those in most peril of insomnia will be the elderly, women, and obese people. These estimations they based on United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change worst-case emissions scenarios.

"Our findings highlight the importance of mitigating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and implementing tailored adaptive measures for vulnerable regions and subgroups to alleviate the sleep deprivation and degraded sleep quality associated with climate warming," noted the propagandist "scientists."

You might be wondering if they considered any other insomnia-inducing culprits such as screen time, medical conditions (e.g., hormonal fluctuations, sleep apnea), lifestyle choices (e.g., diet, drug use), *real, non-model-based* environmental factors (e.g., light and noise levels, bedding quality, indoor air temperature).

Why would they do that? Academics know better than anyone that the way to get their research funded is to blame climate change. — RT

Musk Funding $100M Prize for … Carbon Removal!

DOGE darling Elon Musk is putting up $100 million for development of carbon dioxide removal technology.

It's touted as the "largest incentive prize in history" and "an extraordinary milestone" on the website

XPRIZE.org. That's the non-profit fronting the project, and the Musk Foundation is funding it.

"XPRIZE Carbon Removal is aimed at tackling the biggest threat facing humanity — fighting climate change and rebalancing Earth's carbon cycle," claims the non-profit in a statement that holds an ironic double-meaning, depending on how you read it.

"*Fighting* climate change" is "the biggest threat facing humanity"? Actually, we'd agree that using so-called man-made climate change as a ruse to enslave people is certainly a huge threat facing us all.

But that's not what XPRIZE and its multi-million-dollar donor mean, is it?

"The planet is reaching its highest temperatures in over 3 million years," spins a promotional video. "We need the largest incentive prize in history to help solve it."

The video posits that removing "excess CO_2 from the atmosphere and oceans" will restore "Earth's carbon balance" — whatever that means. In fact, neither XPRIZE nor the Musk Foundation offer data to justify any of their fallacious claims. That's probably because actual data prove otherwise time and time again.

XPRIZE launched its carbon removal project in 2019 when 1,300 teams from 88 countries threw their hats in the ring. Competitors were charged with removing carbon from air, oceans, land, and rocks.

In 2023, XPRIZE selected 20 finalists. To win, contestants must remove and sequester 1,000 tons of CO_2 per year from the atmosphere and must demonstrate the potential to scale to gigaton level by 2050. The grand-prize winner will walk away with $50 million, and the runners up will split the remaining funds, minus unspecified "operational funding" mentioned on the XPRIZE site.

Winners will be announced Earth Day, April 22, 2025. — RT

STAND YOUR GROUND: Fight the CO_2 Pipelines

Big News! Premier Showing! Sign up now for the free, online live viewing of our powerful new documentary, *Unearthing the CO_2 Pipeline*. This viewing will also include the bonus of a live webinar featuring commentary by, and a Q&A with, Mike Boyle and *TNA* Senior Editor Rebecca Terrell. You do not want to miss this. Mark the date: April 22, Earth Day. It's just a coincidence, *of course*, that April 22 is also the birthday of Vladimir Lenin, the mass-murdering Bolshevik founder of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, carbon-capture pipelines are but the latest of the Enviro-Leninists' weapons of mass destruction aimed at complete obliteration of our economy and our freedoms.

It is a huge mistake to assume that the CO_2 pipeline threat is an issue that only affects the Midwest corn belt. Carbon-capture pipeline projects are in various stages of planning and/or construction in states from coast to coast. This is a major part of Agenda 2030, the Green New Deal, and the Great Reset. *The New American* and The John Birch Society have been in the forefront of this battle. Rebecca Terrell has been reporting on this issue for years and has been on the ground meeting with and interviewing key players (farmers, ranchers, state legislators, county commissioners, congressmen, and coalition leaders) in the pipeline fight. She has become the leading expert on this vital topic and the driving force behind this blockbuster documentary.

Please view the video trailers below and share them on social media:

Unearthing the CO_2 Pipeline: Harassment

Unearthing the CO_2 Pipeline: The Time Bomb in Your Backyard

Also, register for the April 22 Live Viewing: UNearthing the CO_2 Pipeline Documentary with Rebecca Terrell and Michael Boyle.

Then, go to Stand Your Ground Studios where we have many CO_2 pipeline videos posted, including the extended interviews with people whose testimony is central to the documentary. Stand Your Ground Studios, an affiliate of the John Birch Society and *The New American*, has done a stupendous job with this video documentary, and the film deserves the widest possible viewing. Please use this as an outreach tool with all of those in your area who are involved in or concerned about farming, ranching, property rights, energy, taxes, and government waste and corruption.

For more information on the CO_2 pipeline scam, these are some of the many articles/videos we have posted on the subject:

Twelve Steps to Preparing Your County for Dangerous Carbon-capture Pipelines

CO2 Pipelines: Trampling on Property Rights & Local Control

Why Should You Care About Carbon Capture?

Standing Firm for Property Rights

Illinois Deals Blow to CO2 Storage; Carbon Capture Heads to ND Supreme Court

Iowa Farmer Warns Carbon Capture Pipeline Could Be Life Threatening

Read them, view them, share them.
— WFJ

Oklahoma City Bombing: 30th Anniversary

April 19, 1995. Hard to believe it has been 30 years since the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City. Veteran readers of *The New American* already will be aware that the official story of the terrorist act contained a series of enormous coverups and lies. As to be expected, we are about to be assaulted with a new round of deception. *National Geographic* has a

new three-part documentary series, "Oklahoma City Bombing: One Day in America," playing on Disney, DirecTV, Hulu, Fubo, and Sling Blue. Netflix is offering "Oklahoma City Bombing: American Terror." HBO and Max are featuring "An American Bombing: The Road to April 19th." Of course, ABC, NBC, CBS, PBS, CNN, and the rest of the regime media crew are also adding reprises of their deceptions from three decades ago.

In the current (April 28) issue of *The New American*, which is also our Vietnam War issue, Paul Dragu presents a survey of our magazine's OKC bombing investigation that challenged (and in many respects *demolished)* the party line narrative on this epochal event. See "The OKC Bombing Coverup, 30 Years Later."
— WFJ

OKC Bombing: What Really Happened?

Thanks to our IT team, we have resurrected most of our previous investigative reports on the OKC bombing and have assembled them in digital format here.

Unfortunately, we do not yet have the many photos and graphics that appeared in the original print magazine stories placed in these online articles. That is unfortunate because the graphic elements are often integral to the information. However, the text is the most important part

of the story, and now you have access to facts, analysis, and perspective that are not available anywhere else. We intend to keep adding to this *TNA*/OKC portal and hope to have many of the graphic elements up in the near future.

Here is a small sampling of the articles available:

Red Flags From an Expert

Multiple Blasts: More Evidence

Explosive Evidence of a Cover-up

Evidence of Prior Knowledge

Prior Knowledge

Undercover: The Howe Revelations

Elohim, Terror, and Truth
— WFJ

Klaus Schwab Steps Down (Sort of) at WEF

Klaus Schwab, the founder and executive chairman of the World Economic Forum, is stepping down as the face of the global billionaires' club infamous for its luxurious champagne-and-caviar soirées, while urging poverty, privation, and sacrifice for the rest of mankind. The 87-year-old Schwab, who looks and sounds like a James Bond villain straight from central casting, has led the globalist organization since its founding in 1971. Schwab announced last year that he would be stepping down in 2025, but now it appears that has been pushed back to 2027. He has not named a successor and may remain on the WEF board of trustees.

Besides Klaus Schwab, the WEF 2024-25 Board of Trustees is a Who's Who of Deep State Insiders:

• Laurence D. Fink — chairman and chief executive officer, BlackRock

• Orit Gadiesh — chairman, Bain & Company

• Kristalina Georgieva — managing director, International Monetary Fund (IMF)

• Al Gore — Fomer U.S. vice president (1993-2001); chairman and co-founder, Generation Investment Management LLP

• Marc Benioff — chair and chief executive officer, Salesforce

• Joe Kaeser — chairman of the Supervisory Board, Siemens Energy

• Christine Lagarde — president, European Central Bank

• Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala — director-general, World Trade Organization (WTO)

• David M. Rubenstein — co-founder and co-chairman, Carlyle

• Zhu Min — member of the Senior Expert Advisory Committee, China Center for International Economic Exchanges (CCIEE)

• H.M. Queen Rania Al Abdullah of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan

Whomever Schwab and the WEF trustees select as Schwab's successor, we can be sure the Davos cabal will continue their schemes for "global transformation," which inevitably points toward their plans for a communist-style world order, with the WEF elites running the globe in the manner of Xi Jinping and the CCP.
— WFJ

[END]